TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE Transcriber's Office

March 22, 1999 LB 142

giving the counties additional money is that they will take on some of the...they will fund...be a pass-through to some of the political subdivisions that were not included in this as it was presented to the voters. And I think that this is the time, when we're adding money...not adding money, but when they are receiving a windfall, this is the time that we have to spell out how we would like to see that allocated and put some safeguards in place, and move into this with the full awareness that when we do look at redistribution it's probably going to mean that we're going to need to look at more money or at least the same amount of money, because if we redistribute it and not have the total amount be at least as much as what we started out with, we will have great...great noise from the constituency that we've created by having these windfalls out there. So, I...I will probably support the suspension, just, as Senator Wehrbein said, to have the opportunity for the discussion. But I'm not certain that I have not been compelled by some of the discussion that we've had that we do have areas that are more serious to address right now, and that the mechanism that is proposed by Senator Beutler may not be the best way to go about it. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Brown. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Madam President, members of the body. don't want to leap ahead too fast to the solution of this. think we need to have this discussion and I hope that it continues right up through noon. I have a couple of comments. One is, as near as I can understand it and grasp it, I...if we are to put additional money into this through the appropriations process, that's one thing. That's true that it can be done. But I do not think at this point the Appropriations Committee is inclined to, let's just say 4.5 million to community colleges, as an example, is inclined to do that until we understand the ramifications throughout the whole distribution formula of cities, counties in particular, somewhat schools, although that apparently is not an issue. But we can't change that formula in For example, if we were to put 4.5 into s, take that 2 million from cities and the committee. community colleges, counties, based on what we have handed out, and just assume that that's correct at this point that there's excess money, I won't call it a windfall again, but there is excess money, we can't make those corrections within that formula because it will fall